arXiv:1206.3742v2 [math.AG] 3 Aug 2012

RIGHT SIMPLE SINGULARITIES IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

GERT-MARTIN GREUEL AND NGUYEN HONG DUC

Abstract. We classify isolated hypersurface singularities $f \in K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$, K an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$, which are simple w.r.t. right equivalence, that is, which have no moduli up to analytic coordinate change. For $K = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ this classification was initiated by Arnol'd, resulting in the famous ADE-series. The classification w.r.t. contact equivalence for $p > 0$ was done by Greuel and Kröning with a result similar to Arnol'd's. It is surprising that w.r.t. right equivalence and for any given $p > 0$ we have only finitely many simple singularities, i.e. there are only finitely many k such that A_k and D_k are right simple, all the others have moduli. A major point of this paper is the generalization of the notion of modality to the algebraic setting, its behaviour under morphisms, and its relations to formal deformation theory. As an application we show that the modality is semicontinuous in any characteristic.

1. Introduction

We classify isolated hypersurface singularities $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$, K an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$, which have no moduli (modality 0) w.r.t. right equivalence, where two hypersurface singularities are called right equivalence if they differ only by an analytic change of coordinates . These singularities are called right simple, following Arnol'd, who classified right simple singularities for $K = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ (cf. [Arn72]) and who showed that they are exactly the ADE-singularities, i.e. the two infinite series $A_k, k \geq 1$, $D_k, k \geq 4$, and the three exceptional singularities E_6, E_7, E_8. It turned out later that the ADE-singularities of Arnol'd are also exactly those of modality 0 for contact equivalence. In the late eighties, Greuel and Kröning showed in [GK90] that the contact simple singularities over a field of positive characteristic are again exactly the ADE-singularities but with a few more normal forms in small characteristic.

A classification w.r.t. right equivalence in positive characteristic however, was never considered so far. A surprising fact of our classification is that for any fixed $p > 0$ there exist only finitely many right simple singularities. For example, if $p = 2$ and n is even, there is just one right simple hypersurface,

$$x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + \ldots + x_{n-1}x_n,$$

while for n odd no right simple singularities exist. A table with normal forms for any $n \geq 1$ and any $p > 0$ is given in section 3 (Theorems 3.1 - 3.3). The problem is even interesting for univariate power series ($n = 1$) where we give a complete classification.

In section 2 we give a precise definition of the number of moduli (G–modality) for power series w.r.t. an equivalence relation given by the orbits of an algebraic group G, acting on an algebraic

---

Date: March 8, 2013.

variety, being the parameter space of a family of power series. In fact, we give two definitions, G-mod and G–par, both given by the action of an algebraic group G on a variety X and show that they coincide (Propositions 2.3 and 2.7), a result which is valid in any characteristic. This unifies the arguments later, avoiding a lot of similar calculations for different cases.

Moreover, we prove that the G-modality is upper semicontinuous for G the right resp. the contact group (Proposition 2.18).

We introduce the notion of G-completeness which suffices to determine the modality and generalize the Kas-Schlessinger theorem [KaS72] to deformations (unfoldings) of formal power series over algebraic varieties. An algebraic representative of the semiuniversal deformation with section of an isolated hypersurface singularity is G-complete (for G the right resp. the contact group, see Proposition 2.25). However, in contrast to the complex analytic case the usual semiuniversal deformation is not sufficient to determine the modality and hence is not G-complete; we have to consider versal deformations with section (cf. Example 2.24).

2. MODALITY

In the sixties V. I. Arnol'd introduced the notion of modality into singularity theory for real and complex hypersurfaces (cf. [AGV85, Part II]), related to Riemann's idea of moduli for Riemann surfaces. The purpose of this section is to make the notion of modality precise in the case of hypersurfaces over an algebraically closed field K of arbitrary characteristic. To do this we introduce the *number of parameters* and the *modality* for the action of an algebraic group G on the *algebraic variety* [1] X, and show that both notions coincide. Moreover, we generalize these notions to an equivalence relation induced by the above action and by a morphism $h : X' \to X$. The results of this section are used for the classification in Section 3.

2.1. G-modality.

The following definition makes Arnol'd's modality, given in [AGV85], precise.

Definition 2.1. Let $U \subset X$ be an open neighbourhood of $x \in X$ and W be constructible in X. We introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_x W &:= \max\{\dim Z \mid Z \text{ an irreducible component of } W \text{ containing } x\},\\ U(i) &:= U_G(i) := \{y \in U \mid \dim_y(U \cap G\cdot y) = i\}, i \geq 0,\\ G\text{-par}(U) &:= \max_{i\geq 0}\{\dim U(i) - i\}, \end{aligned}$$

and call

$$G\text{-par}(x) := \min\{G\text{-par}(U) \mid U \text{ a neighbourhood of x}\}$$

the *number of G-parameters* of x (in X).

Note that here and later, wherever we write $\dim S$, the set S is *constructible*, i.e. it is a finite union of locally closed subsets of a variety.

---

[1] By an algebraic variety we mean a separated scheme of finite type over an algebraically closed field K, see [Har77], which is fixed through this paper. By a point we mean a closed point.

Now we use a Rosenlicht stratification of X under the action of G to give the definition of modality. By Rosenlicht [Ros56, Theorem 2] (see also [Ros63]) there exists an open dense subset $X_1 \subset X$, which is invariant under G s.t. X_1/G is a geometric quotient (cf. [MFK82, §1]), in particular, the orbit space X_1/G is an algebraic variety and the projection $p_1 \colon X_1 \to X_1/G,\ x \mapsto [x]$, is a surjective morphism with fibers being the G–orbits.

Since $X \setminus X_1$ is a variety of lower dimension, which is invariant under G, we can apply the theorem of Rosenlicht to $X \setminus X_1$ and get an invariant open dense subset $X_2 \subset X \setminus X_1$ s.t. X_2/G is a geometric quotient. Continuing in this way with $X_3 \subset (X \setminus X_1) \setminus X_2$, we can finally write X as finite disjoint union of G-invariant locally closed algebraic subvarieties $X_i, i = 1, \dots, s$, such that X_i/G is a geometric quotient with quotient morphism $p_i \colon X_i \to X_i/G$. We call $\{X_i, i = 1, \dots, s\}$ a *Rosenlicht stratification of* X *under* G. Note that a Rosenlicht stratification is by no means unique and that the proof of Rosenlicht, which works for arbitrary G, is not constructive.

Definition 2.2. Let $\{X_i, i = 1, \dots, s\}$ be a Rosenlicht stratification of the algebraic variety X under the action of an algebraic group G with quotient morphisms $p_i : X_i \to X_i/G$, and let U be an open neighbourhood of $x \in X$. We define

$$G\text{-mod}(U) := \max_{1 \le i \le s} \{\dim \big(p_i(U \cap X_i)\big)\},$$

and call

$$G\text{-mod}(x) := \min\{G\text{-mod}(U) \mid U \text{ a neighbourhood of x}\}$$

the *G-modality* of x (in X).

Proposition 2.3. *We have* G-par$(U) = G$-mod(U) *and therefore* G-par$(x) = G$-mod(x) *for all* $x \in X$.

This is a special case of Proposition 2.7, taking h the identity morphism. It shows in particular that G-mod(U) and G-mod(x) are independent of the Rosenlicht stratification.

Proposition 2.4. *Let the algebraic group G act on the variety X.*

(i) *If G and X are both irreducible then* G-mod$(x) \ge \dim X - \dim G$.

(ii) *For any $y \in G \cdot x$,* G-mod$(x) = G$-mod(y).

(iii) *If the subvariety $X' \subset X$ is invariant under G and if $x \in X'$ then*

$$G\text{-mod}(x) \text{ in } X \ge G\text{-mod}(x) \text{ in } X'.$$

Equality holds if G-mod(x) *in* $X' \ge G$-mod(y), $\forall y \in X \setminus X'$.

(iv) *Let the algebraic group G' act on the variety X' and let $p : X \to X'$ be a morphism of varieties.*

  (1) *If p is open and if*

$$G \cdot x \subset p^{-1}\big(G' \cdot p(x)\big),\ \forall x \in X,$$

  then

$$G\text{-mod}(x) \ge G'\text{-mod}(p(x)),\ \forall x \in X.$$

(2) *If p is* equivariant *(i.e. $G \cdot x = p^{-1}\big(G' \cdot p(x)\big)$, $\forall x \in X$), then*

$$G\text{-mod}(x) \le G'\text{-mod}(p(x)),\ \forall x \in X.$$

In particular, if p is open and equivariant then $G\text{-mod}(x) = G'\text{-mod}(p(x))$, $\forall x \in X$.

For the elementary but not so short proof we refer to [Ng12].

2.2. **G-modality with respect to a morphism.** We generalize the previous notation to morphisms into a G-variety X.

Definition 2.5. Let the algebraic group G act on the variety X, let $h : X' \to X$ be a morphism of algebraic varieties and let U' be an open neighbourhood of $x' \in X'$. For $u' \in U'$ and each $i \ge 0$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} V_{G,h}(u') &:= \{v' \in X' \mid G \cdot h(v') = G \cdot h(u')\} = h^{-1}(G \cdot h(u')), \\ U'(i) &:= U'_{G,h}(i) := \{u' \in U' \mid \dim_{u'}\big(U' \cap V_{G,h}(u')\big) = i\}, \\ G\text{-par}_h(U') &:= \max_{i \ge 0}\{\dim U'_{G,h}(i) - i\}, \end{aligned}$$

and call

$$G\text{-par}_h(x') := \min\{G\text{-par}_h(U') \mid U' \text{ a neighbourhood of } x' \in X'\}$$

the number of G-parameters of x' w.r.t. h.

Definition 2.6. Let $\{X_j, j = 1, \dots, s\}$ be a Rosenlicht stratification of X under G with projections $p_j : X_j \to X_j/G$, let $h : X' \to X$ be a morphism of algebraic varieties and let U' be an open neighbourhood of $x' \in X'$. Set $X'_j := h^{-1}(X_j)$, $U'_j := U' \cap X'_j$. We define

$$G\text{-mod}_h(U') := \max_{j=1,\dots,s}\{\dim\big(p_j(h(U'_j))\big)\},$$

and call

$$G\text{-mod}_h(x') := \min\{G\text{-mod}(U') \mid U' \text{ a neighbourhood of } x' \text{ in } X'\}$$

the *G-modality* of x' w.r.t. h.

Proposition 2.7. *We have $G\text{-par}_h(U') = G\text{-mod}_h(U')$ and therefore $G\text{-par}_h(x') = G\text{-mod}_h(x')$ for all $x' \in X'$.*

For the proof we recall some well-known properties of fibers of a morphism ([Mum88], [Bor91]). Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphism of (not necessarily irreducible) algebraic varieties. First, Chevalley's theorem says that if $W \subset X$ is constructible in X, then $f(W)$ is constructible in Y. Secondly, the function $x \mapsto e(x) := \dim_x f^{-1}(f(x))$ is *upper semi-continuous*, i.e. for all integers n the set $\{x \in X \mid e(x) \ge n\}$ is closed. For the proof of these statements and the following lemma some well known results in [Mum88, I.8] for irreducible varieties, are used. For details see [Ng12].

Lemma 2.8. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphism algebraic varieties and let $e : X \to \mathbb{N}$ be the function defined by $x \mapsto e(x) := \dim_x f^{-1}(f(x))$.*

(i) *If $e(x)$ is constant, say $e(x) = i$ for all $x \in X$, then*

$$\dim X = i + \dim f(X).$$

(ii) *We have*

$$\max_{i \geq 0}\{\dim\big(e^{-1}(i)\big) - i\} \geq \dim f(X).$$

Proof of Proposition 2.7. We use the notations of Definition 2.5 and consider the composition

$$h_j : U'_j \xrightarrow{h} X_j \xrightarrow{p_j} X_j/G.$$

Note that

$$h_j^{-1}(h_j(x')) = U'_j \cap h^{-1}((G \cdot h(x'))) = U'_j \cap V_{G,h}(x'),\ \forall x' \in U'_j.$$

By the upper semi-continuity of the functions $e_j : U'_j \to \mathbb{N}, x' \mapsto \dim_{x'} h_j^{-1}(h_j(x'))$, the sets $e_j^{-1}(i)$ are locally closed and then

$$U'(i) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{s} e_j^{-1}(i)$$

is constructible in X' for all $i \geq 0$.

Taking an i such that $G\text{-par}_h(U') = \dim U'(i) - i$ and applying Lemma 2.8(i) we deduce

$$G\text{-par}_h(U') = \max_j\{\dim e_j^{-1}(i) - i\} = \max_j\{\dim\big(h_j(e_j^{-1}(i))\big)\} \leq G\text{-mod}_h(U').$$

Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ be such that

$$G\text{-mod}_h(U') = \dim\big(p_j(h(U'_j))\big) = \dim h_j(U'_j).$$

Then

$$G\text{-par}_h(U') = \max_i\{\dim U'(i) - i\} \geq \max_i\{\dim(e_j^{-1}(i)) - i\} \geq \dim h_j(X'_j) = G\text{-mod}_h(U'),$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 2.8(ii). Hence $G\text{-par}_h(U') = G\text{-mod}_h(U')$. □

Let the algebraic group G act on the variety X. The proofs of the following corollaries follow easily from Definition 2.5, 2.6 and Proposition 2.7 (for details we refer to [Ng12]).

Corollary 2.9. *Let $h : X' \to X$ be a morphism of algebraic varieties. Then*

$$G\text{-mod}_h(x') \leq G\text{-mod}(h(x')),\ \forall x' \in X'.$$

Equality holds if for every open neighbourhood U' of x', there exists an open neighbourhood U of $h(x')$ in X s.t. $U \subset h(U')$. In particular, equality holds if h is open.

Corollary 2.10. *Let*

$$g : X'' \overset{h'}{\to} X' \overset{h}{\to} X$$

be morphisms of algebraic varieties. Then

$$G\text{-mod}_g(x'') \leq G\text{-mod}_h(h'(x'')),\ \forall x'' \in X''.$$

Equality holds if for every open neighbourhood U'' of x'', there exists an open neighbourhood U' of $h'(x'')$ in X' s.t. $U' \subset h'(U'')$. In particular, equality holds if h' is open.

Corollary 2.11. *Let the algebraic groups G resp. G' act on the varieties X resp. X'. Let*

$$h : Y \to X \text{ and } h' : Y \to X'$$

be two morphisms of varieties such that

$$h^{-1}(G \cdot h(y)) = h'^{-1}(G' \cdot h'(y)), \forall y \in Y.$$

Then for any open subset $V \subset Y$ we have $G\text{-mod}_h(V) = G'\text{-mod}_{h'}(V)$. Consequently

$$G\text{-mod}_h(y) = G'\text{-mod}_{h'}(y), \ \forall y \in Y.$$

Corollary 2.12. *Let $h : X' \to X$ and $h_i : Y_i \to X, i = 1, \dots, k$, be morphisms of varieties and let U' be open in X' satisfying, that for all $x' \in U'$ there exist an index i and $y_i \in Y_i$ such that*

$$G \cdot h(x') = G \cdot h_i(y_i).$$

Then

$$G\text{-mod}_h(U') \le \max_i \{G\text{-mod}_{h_i}(Y_i)\} \le \max_i \{\dim Y_i\}.$$

2.3. **Right and Contact Modality.** The group $\mathcal{R} := Aut_K(K[[\mathbf{x}]])$ of automorphisms of the local analytic algebra $K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ is called the *right group.* The *contact group* $\mathcal{K}$ is the semi-direct product of $Aut_K(K[[\mathbf{x}]])$ with the group $(K[[\mathbf{x}]])^*$ of units in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. These groups acts on $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{R} \times K[[\mathbf{x}]] & \longrightarrow & K[[\mathbf{x}]] \\ (\Phi, f) & \mapsto & \Phi(f) \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K} \times K[[\mathbf{x}]] & \longrightarrow & K[[\mathbf{x}]] \\ ((\Phi, u), f) & \mapsto & u \cdot \Phi(f). \end{array}$$

Two elements $f, g \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ are called *right* ($\sim_r$) resp. *contact* ($\sim_c$) *equivalent* iff they belong to the same $\mathcal{R}$- resp. $\mathcal{K}$-orbit.

Note that neither $\mathcal{R}$ nor $\mathcal{K}$ are algebraic groups, as they are infinite dimensional. In order to be able to apply the results from the previous section, we have to pass to the jet spaces.

An element Φ in the right group $\mathcal{R}$ is uniquely determined by n power series

$$\varphi_i := \Phi(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_i^j x_j + \text{ terms of higher oder}$$

such that $\det(a_i^j) \neq 0$. For each integer k we define the k-jet of Φ,

$$\Phi_k := (j^k(\varphi_1), \dots, j^k(\varphi_n)),$$

where $j^k(\varphi_i)$ is the k-jet of φ_i, i.e. the image of φ_i in the k-th jet space

$$J_k := K[[\mathbf{x}]]/\mathfrak{m}^{k+1},$$

$\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal of $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, represented in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ by the power series expansion of φ_i up to order k. We call

$$\mathcal{R}_k := \{\Phi_k \mid \Phi \in \mathcal{R}\} \text{ respectively } \mathcal{K}_k := \{(\Phi_k, j^k u) \mid (\Phi, u) \in \mathcal{K}\}$$

the k-jet of $\mathcal{R}$ respectively of $\mathcal{K}$. Note that J_k is an affine space and $\mathcal{R}_k, \mathcal{K}_k$ are affine algebraic groups, all equipped with the Zariskis topology. These groups act algebraically on J_k by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}_k \times J_k & \longrightarrow & J_k \\ (\Phi_k, j^k f) & \mapsto & j^k(\Phi(f)) \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}_k \times J_k & \longrightarrow & J_k \\ ((\Phi_k, j^k u), j^k f) & \mapsto & j^k(u \cdot \Phi(f)). \end{array}$$

For $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, let $\mu(f) := \dim K[[\mathbf{x}]]/j(f)$ be the *Milnor number* and $\tau(f) := \dim K[[\mathbf{x}]]/(\langle f \rangle + j(f))$ the *Tjurina number* of f, where $j(f)$ is the ideal in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ generated by all partials of f.

Definition 2.13. Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ be such that $\mu(f) < \infty$ resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$ and let $G = \mathcal{R}$ resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$. We define the *G-modality* of f, G-mod(f), to be the G_k-modality of $j^k(f)$ in J_k (in the sense of Definition 2.2) for sufficiently large integer k. We call f *G-simple, G-unimodal, G-bimodal* if G-mod(f) equals to 0, 1, 2, respectively.

Here, an integer k is *sufficiently large* for f w.r.t. G if there exists a neighbourhood U of $j^k(f)$ in J_k s.t. every $g \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ with $j^k g \in U$ is *k-determined w.r.t. G*, which means that each $h \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ s.t. $j^k(h) = j^k(g)$, is right resp. contact equivalent to g. Combining Propositions 2.17 and 2.23 below we obtain that G-mod(f) is independent of the sufficiently large k. The existence of a sufficiently large integer k for f w.r.t G will be shown in Proposition 2.15.

We introduce some notions. Let T be an *affine variety over K* with the structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_T$ and its algebra of global section $\mathcal{O}(T) = \mathcal{O}_T(T)$. If $F = \sum a_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(T)[[\mathbf{x}]], a_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(T)$, then $a_\alpha(\mathbf{t}) \in K$ denotes the image of a_α in $\mathcal{O}_{T,t}/\mathfrak{m}_t = K$ with $\mathfrak{m}_t$ the maximal ideal of the stalk $\mathcal{O}_{T,t}$, and therefore $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ for each $\mathbf{t} \in T$. In the following we write $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ instead of F, just to show the variables $\mathbf{x}$ and the parameter $\mathbf{t} \in T$. Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ and $\mathbf{t}_0 \in T$. An element $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \in \mathcal{O}(T)[[\mathbf{x}]]$ is called an *unfolding* or *deformation with trivial section* of f at $\mathbf{t}_0 \in T$ over T if $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}_0) = f$ and $f_{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathfrak{m} = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ for all $\mathbf{t} \in T$. The first statement of the following lemma says that the Milnor number μ and the Tjurina number τ are semi-continuous w.r.t. unfoldings. Its proof can be adapted from the construction in [GLS06, Thm. I.2.6] by applying [Har77, Thm. 12.8]. The second statement follows from (i).

Lemma 2.14 (Semi-continuity of μ and τ)**.** (i) *Let $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ be an unfolding of f at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over an affine variety T. Then there exists an open neighbourhood $U \subset T$ of $\mathbf{t}_0$ such that*

$$\mu(f_{\mathbf{t}}) \leq \mu(f), \text{ resp. } \tau(f_{\mathbf{t}}) \leq \tau(f), \forall \mathbf{t} \in U.$$

(ii) *The functions μ, τ are upper semi-continuous, i.e. for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets*

$$U_{\mu,i} := \{f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] \mid \mu(f) \leq i\} \text{ resp. } U_{\tau,i} := \{f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] \mid \tau(f) \leq i\}$$

are open in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ w.r.t. the topology induced by the projections $j^k : K[[\mathbf{x}]] \to J_k$, i.e. the coarsest topology s.t. all projections are continuous.

Proposition 2.15. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ be such that $\mu(f) < \infty$ (resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$) and let $G = \mathcal{R}$ (resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$). Then all $k \geq 2 \cdot \mu(f)$ (resp. $k \geq 2 \cdot \tau(f)$) are sufficiently large for f w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}$ (resp. w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}$).*

Proof. By the upper semi-continuity of μ, τ, the subsets

$$U_\mu := \{g \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] \mid \mu(g) \le \mu(f)\} \text{ and } U_\tau := \{g \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] \mid \tau(g) \le \tau(f)\}$$

are open. It follows from [BGM12, Cor. 1] that g is k-determined w.r.t. G for all $g \in U_\mu$ (resp. U_τ) and all $k \ge 2 \cdot \mu(f)$ (resp. $k \ge 2 \cdot \tau(f)$). This means that k is sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G. ☐

Definition 2.16. Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ be such that $\mu(f) < \infty$ (resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$). Let $G = \mathcal{R}$ (resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$). Let $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})$ be an unfolding of f at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over an affine variety T. Let k be sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G and let Φ_k be the morphism of algebraic varieties defined by

$$\Phi_k : T \to J_k,\ \mathbf{t} \mapsto j^k f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

We define $G\text{-mod}_F(f) := G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0)$ and call it the *G-modality* or the *number of G-parameters* of f w.r.t. the unfolding F. Note that G_k acts on on J_k and that $G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0)$ is understood in the sense of Definition 2.6.

Proposition 2.17. *The number $G\text{-mod}_F(f)$ is independent of the sufficient large integer k for f w.r.t. G.*

Proof. Let U_G denotes the open neighbourhood U_μ resp. U_τ of f in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, defined as in the proof of Proposition 2.15. It is easy to see that the map

$$\Phi : T \longrightarrow K[[\mathbf{x}]],\ \mathbf{t} \mapsto f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})$$

is continuous. Then the pre-image $V_G = \Phi^{-1}(U_G)$ is an open neighbourhood of $\mathbf{t}_0$. For each k sufficient large for f w.r.t. G we consider the map

$$\varphi_k : V_G \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} T \xrightarrow{\Phi} K[[\mathbf{x}]] \xrightarrow{j^k} J_k.$$

By Corollary 2.10,

$$G\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0) = G\text{-mod}_{\varphi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0)$$

since $\Phi_k = j^k \circ \Phi$. If k_1, k_2 are both sufficient large for f w.r.t. G, then we can easily check that

$$\varphi_{k_1}^{-1}\big(G_{k_1} \cdot \varphi_{k_1}(\mathbf{t})\big) = \varphi_{k_2}^{-1}\big(G_{k_2} \cdot \varphi_{k_2}(\mathbf{t})\big),\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in V_G.$$

Corollary 2.11 yields that

$$G_{k_1}\text{-mod}_{\varphi_{k_1}}(\mathbf{t}_0) = G_{k_2}\text{-mod}_{\varphi_{k_2}}(\mathbf{t}_0)$$

and hence $G_{k_1}\text{-mod}_{\Phi_{k_1}}(\mathbf{t}_0) = G_{k_2}\text{-mod}_{\Phi_{k_2}}(\mathbf{t}_0)$, which proves the proposition. ☐

Proposition 2.18 (Semicontinuity of modality)**.** *Let $G = \mathcal{R}$ (resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$). Then the G-modality is upper semicontinunous, i.e. for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets*

$$U_i := \{f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] | G\text{-mod}(f) \le i\}$$

is open in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. Consequently, the G-modality is upper semicontinunous under unfoldings, i.e. for any unfolding $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over T of f with $\mu(f) < \infty$ (resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$) then the set

$$U_f := \{\mathbf{t} \in T | G\text{-mod}(f_{\mathbf{t}}) \le G\text{-mod}(f)\}$$

is open in T.

Proof. Let $f \in U_i$, let k be sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G , and let U' be an open neighbourhood of $j^k f$ in J_k such that k is sufficiently large for all $g \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ with $j^k g \in U'$. Then for every $g \in U'$, G-mod$(g) = G_k$-mod$(j^k g)$. Take an open neighbourhood U'' of $j^k f$ in J_k such that G_k-mod$(j^k f) = G_k$-mod$(U'') = i$ and set $U := (j^k)^{-1}(U' \cap U'')$. It is easy to see that U is an open neighbourhood of f in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ and $U \subset U_i$. This implies that U_i is open in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. □

So far we considered families of singularities parametrized by (affine) varieties, in particular by sufficiently height jet spaces. Now we want to use the semiuniversal deformation of a singularity since its base space has much smaller dimension. However for moduli problems, the formal deformation theory is not sufficient. We have to pass to the étale topology and apply Artin's resp. Elkik's algebraization theorems.

Recall that an étale neighbourhood of a point x in a variety X consists of a variety U with a point $u \in U$ and an étale morphism $\varphi : U \to X$ with $\varphi(u) = x$ (see, [Mum88, Definition III.5.1]). φ is a morphism of pointed varieties, usually denoted by $\varphi : U, u \to X, x$. The connected étale neighbourhoods form a filtered system and the direct limit

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} := \varinjlim \mathcal{O}_{U,u} = \varinjlim \mathcal{O}(U)$$

is called the *Henselization* (see [Na53], [Ra70], [KPPRM78]) of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. We have $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{U,u}$ where $^\wedge$ denotes the completion w.r.t. the maximal ideal. The Henselization of $K[\mathbf{x}]_{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle}$ is the ring $K\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ of algebraic power series in $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. $K[\mathbf{x}] \subset K\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ and $K\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ may be considered as the union of $\mathcal{O}(U) \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ or $\mathcal{O}_{U,u} \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. More precisely

Remark 2.19. For each finite subset $A \subset K\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ there exists an étale neighbourhood $\varphi : U, \mathbf{u}_0 \to \mathbb{A}^n, 0$ such that $A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(U)$, i.e. for all algebraic power series $a(x) \in A$ we have $a(\varphi(u)) \in \mathcal{O}(U)$.

Definition 2.20. Let $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ be an unfolding of f at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over an affine variety T.

(a) An unfolding $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$ at $\mathbf{s}_0$ over an affine variety S of f is called a *pullback* or an *induced unfolding* of F if there exists a morphism $\varphi : S, \mathbf{s}_0 \to T, \mathbf{t}_0$ s.t. $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) = F(\mathbf{x}, \varphi(\mathbf{s}))$.

(b) An unfolding $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$ at $\mathbf{s}_0$ over an affine variety S of f is called a *G-pullback* or a *G-induced unfolding* (more precisely: étale G–pullback and étale G–induced) of F if there exist an étale neighbourhood $\varphi : W, \mathbf{w}_0 \to S, \mathbf{s}_0$ and a morphism $\psi : W, \mathbf{w}_0 \to T, \mathbf{t}_0$ such that $G \cdot H(\mathbf{x}, \varphi(\mathbf{w})) = G \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, \psi(\mathbf{w}))$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in W$.

(c) The unfolding $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ is called *G-complete* if any unfolding of f is a G-pullback of F.

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the definition.

Lemma 2.21. *Let H be a G-pullback of the unfolding F. If H is G-complete, then so is F.*

Proposition 2.22. *Any singularity f with $\mu(f) < \infty$ (resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$) has a right (resp. contact) complete unfolding. More precisely, if k is sufficiently large for f w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}$ (resp. w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}$), then* *the unfolding of* f *over* $J_k = \mathbb{A}^N$ *(with the identification:* $\sum_{|\alpha|\le k} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mapsto (c_\alpha)_{|\alpha|\le k}$*),*

$$f_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{c}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha,$$

is right (resp. contact) complete.

Proof. Since k is sufficiently large for f w.r.t. right (resp. contact) equivalence, there exists a neighbourhood $U \subset J_k$ of $j^k f$ such that each $g \in U$ is right (resp. contact) k-determined. Let $h_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) := H(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s})$ be an arbitrary unfolding of f at $\mathbf{s}_0$ over S and let $W := \psi^{-1}(U)$ be the pre-image of U by the morphism

$$\psi : S \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^N, \mathbf{s} \mapsto j^k h_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) - j^k f(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then $H(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s})$ is right (resp. contact) equivalent to $F(\mathbf{x},\psi(\mathbf{s}))$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in W$ since

$$j^k H(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s}) = j^k F(\mathbf{x},\psi(\mathbf{s})) \in U$$

and hence H is a right (resp. a contact) pullback of F, which proves the proposition. □

Proposition 2.23. *Let* $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ *be such that* $\mu(f) < \infty$ *(resp.* $\tau(f) < \infty$*) and let* $G = \mathcal{R}$ *(resp.* $G = \mathcal{K}$*). Let* $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{t})$ *be an unfolding of* f *at* $\mathbf{t}_0$ *over* T*.*

(i) *If the unfolding* $h_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) := H(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s})$ *of* f *at* $\mathbf{s}_0$ *over* S*, is a* G*-pullback of* F*, then* $G\text{-mod}_H(f) \le G\text{-mod}_F(f)$*.*

(ii) *We always have* $G\text{-mod}_F(f) \le G\text{-mod}(f)$*. Equality holds if* $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{t})$ *is* G*-complete.*

Proof. (i) Since H is a G-pullback of F, there exist an étale neighbourhood $\varphi : W, \mathbf{w}_0 \to S, \mathbf{s}_0$ and a morphism $\psi : W, \mathbf{w}_0 \to T, \mathbf{t}_0$ such that $G \cdot H(\mathbf{x},\varphi(\mathbf{w})) = G \cdot F(\mathbf{x},\psi(\mathbf{w}))$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in W$.

Let k be sufficiently large for f and let Φ_k and Ψ_k be the morphisms defined by

$$\Phi_k : T \to J_k, \mathbf{t} \mapsto j^k f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and } \Psi_k : S \to J_k, \mathbf{s} \mapsto j^k h_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then $\Phi^{-1}(G\cdot\Phi(\mathbf{w})) = \Psi^{-1}(G\cdot\Psi(\mathbf{w}))$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in W$ with $\Phi := \Phi_k \circ \psi$ and $\Psi := \Psi_k \circ \varphi$. Combining Corollary 2.10 and 2.11 we obtain

$$G\text{-mod}_F(f) = G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0) \ge G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi}(\mathbf{w}_0) = G_k\text{-mod}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{w}_0) = G_k\text{-mod}_{\Psi_k}(\mathbf{s}_0) = G\text{-mod}_H(f).$$

(ii) Since k is sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G,

$$G\text{-mod}(f) = G_k\text{-mod}(j^k f) \text{ and } G\text{-mod}_F(f) = G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.9 that $G_k\text{-mod}(j^k f) \ge G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(\mathbf{t}_0)$. Hence

$$G\text{-mod}(f) \ge G\text{-mod}_F(f).$$

We identify J_k with K^N via the map $\sum_{|\alpha|\le k} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mapsto (c_\alpha)_{|\alpha|\le k}$ and consider the unfolding

$$h_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}) := H(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{c}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$$

of f at 0 over K^N. Since the translation

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \psi : K^N & \longrightarrow & J_k & = & K^N \\ \mathbf{c} & \mapsto & j^k h_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}) & = & j^k f + \mathbf{c} \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism, it follows from Corollary 2.9 that

$$G_k\text{-mod}(j^k f) = G_k\text{-mod}_\psi(0)$$

and hence G-mod$(f) = G$-mod$_H(f)$.

Now, if the unfolding F is G-complete, then H is a G-pullback of F. By (i), G-mod$_H(f) \leq G$-mod$_F(f)$ and hence G-mod$(f) = G$-mod$_F(f)$. ☐

Example 2.24. (a) The unfolding $F(x, \mathbf{t}) = x^{p+1} + t_1 x + \ldots + t_p x^p$ of $f = x^{p+1}$ over $T = \mathbb{A}^p$, is right complete. Indeed, for any unfolding $H(x, \mathbf{s})$ of f at $\mathbf{s}_0$ over S we write

$$H(x, \mathbf{s}) = a_1(\mathbf{s})x + \ldots + a_p(\mathbf{s})x^p + a_{p+1}(\mathbf{s})x^{p+1} + \ldots$$

with $a_i(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{O}(S)$. Then $a_i(\mathbf{s}_0) = 0 \ \forall i \leq p$ and $a_{p+1}(\mathbf{s}_0) \neq 0$. Consider the morphism $\varphi : S \to T$, $\mathbf{s} \mapsto \big(a_0(\mathbf{s}), \ldots, a_p(\mathbf{s})\big)$ and the open neighbourhood $W := S \setminus \{\mathbf{s} \in S \mid a_{p+1}(\mathbf{s}_0) = 0\}$ of $\mathbf{s}_0$ in S. Then it follows from [BGM12, Thm. 2.1] that

$$F(x, \varphi(\mathbf{s})) \sim_r H(x, \mathbf{s}), \text{ for each } \mathbf{s} \in W.$$

Note that $\{x, \ldots, x^p\}$ is a basis of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}j(f)$ and that F is a semiuniversal deformation of f with trivial section by Proposition 2.25.

(b) The right semi-universal deformation of $f = x^{p+1} \in K[[x]]$ with $char(K) = p > 2$ is given by $H(x, \mathbf{t}) = x^{p+1} + t_1 x + \ldots + t_{p-1} x^{p-1}$. This unfolding of f over $\mathbb{A}^{p-1}$ is not right complete. In fact, it is not difficult to see that $H(x, \mathbf{t})$ is equivalent to one of $\{x, \ldots, x^{p-1}, x^{p+1}\}$ for $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{A}^p$. Corollary 2.27 yields that $\mathcal{R}$-mod$_H(f) = 0$, while $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(f) > 0$ by Theorem 3.1 and hence H is not right complete due to Proposition 2.18.

To see this directly, consider the family $x^{p+1} + sx^p$ in characteristic $p > 0$ over K which, as an unfolding with trivial section, cannot be induced by a morphism $\varphi : \mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathbb{A}^{p-1}$: Since $H(x, \varphi(s))$ has multiplicity $\neq p$ in $K[[x]]$ for all $s \neq 0$, it cannot be right equivalent to $x^{p+1} + sx^p$ which has multiplicity p for $s \neq 0$.

This is of course not a contradiction to F being versal as deformation without section, since this means that the family $x^{p+1} + sx^p \in K[[x, s]]$ can be induced from H by a morphism $\varphi : K[[t_1, \ldots, t_{p-1}]] \to K[[s]]$ (up to right equivalence in $K[[x, s]]$ over $K[[s]]$). In fact, define φ by $t_1 \mapsto -s^p, t_i \mapsto 0$ for $i > 1$, then, if $char(K) = p$,

$$H(x, \varphi(s)) = -s^p x + x^{p+1} = (x - s)^p x \sim_r x^{p+1} + sx^p,$$

via the isomorphism $\Phi : K[[x, s]] \to K[[x, s]]$ over $K[[s]]$, given by $x \mapsto x - s, s \mapsto s$. However, Φ does not respect the trivial section.

If $char(K) \neq p$, we can use the Tschirnhaus transformation $x \mapsto x - \dfrac{s}{p}$ to eliminate sx^p from $x^{p+1} + sx^p$ and to show that $x^{p+1} + sx^p$ can be induced from H.

The following proposition is stronger than Proposition 2.22 because it reduces the number of parameters of a G-complete unfolding considerably. For the proof we need the nested Artin approximation theorem.

Proposition 2.25. *Let* $f \in \mathfrak{m} \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ *be such that* $\mu(f) < \infty$ *(resp.* $\tau(f) < \infty$*). Let* $g_1, \ldots, g_l \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ *be a system of generators of the algebra* $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m} \cdot j(f)$ *(resp. of* $\mathfrak{m}/\langle f\rangle + \mathfrak{m} \cdot j(f)$*). Then the unfolding (with trivial section) of* f *over* $\mathbb{A}^l$*,*

$$F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} t_i g_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

represents a formally semiuniversal deformation of f *with trivial section with respect to right (resp. contact) equivalence. Moreover, it is right (resp. contact) complete.*

Proof. We first show that F represents a formally semiuniversal deformation of f with trivial section with respect to right (resp. contact) equivalence. Indeed in [BGM12, Proposition 2.7] it is shown that the tangent space to the base space of the semiuniversal deformation with trivial section is $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m} \cdot j(f)$ (resp. $\mathfrak{m}/\langle f\rangle + \mathfrak{m} \cdot j(f)$). The proof of the existence of a semiuniversal deformation in [KaS72] or [GLS06, Thm. II.1.16] can be easily adapted to deformations with section, showing the versality of F and hence proving the first claim.

Let $G = \mathcal{R}$ (resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$) and let k be sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G. Then we may replace F resp. f by j^kF resp. j^kf and assume that $F \in K[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}]$ and $f \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ by the following facts:

(a) $\{j^k g_1, \ldots, j^k g_l\}$ is a system of generators of the algebra $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m} \cdot j(j^kf)$ (resp. of $\mathfrak{m}/\langle f\rangle + \mathfrak{m} \cdot j(j^kf)$).

(b) F is G-complete if and only if $j^kF(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ is a G-complete unfolding of j^kf at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over T (see [Ng12]).

Consider the complete unfolding of f over $\mathbb{A}^N = J_k$

$$h_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}) := H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{|\alpha| \le k} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$$

as in Proposition 2.22. By Lemma 2.21, the proof is completed by showing that H is a G-pullback of F.

In fact, the versality of F implies that there exist formal power series $\hat{\Phi} = (\hat{\Phi}_1, \ldots, \hat{\Phi}_n) \in \big(\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle K[[\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}]]\big)^n$, $\hat{\varphi} = (\hat{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \hat{\varphi}_l) \in \big(\langle\mathbf{c}\rangle K[[\mathbf{c}]]\big)^l$ and a unit $\hat{u}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}) \in K[[\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}]]$ (with $\hat{u} = 1$ for $G = \mathcal{R}$) with

$$\hat{u}(0,0) \neq 0 \text{ and } \Big(\det\big(\frac{\partial \hat{\Phi}_i}{\partial x_j}\big)\Big)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0, \tag{2.1}$$

such that

$$H\big(\hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}\big) = \hat{u}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}) \cdot F\big(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\varphi}(\mathbf{c})\big).$$

Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n+l+1})$ be new indeterminates (omitting y_{n+l+1} if $G = \mathcal{R}$) and let

$$P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y}) = H(y_1, \ldots, y_n, \mathbf{c}) - y_{n+l+1} \cdot F(\mathbf{x}, y_{n+1}, \ldots, y_{n+l}) \in K[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y}].$$

The formal versality of F implies that $P=0$ has a formal solution $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}) \in K[[\mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}]]$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_i &:= \hat{\Phi}_i \in K\langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle, 1 \le i \le n, \\ \hat{y}_{n+j} &:= \hat{\varphi}_j \in K\langle \mathbf{c}\rangle, 1 \le j \le l, \\ \hat{y}_{n+l+1} &:= \hat{u} \in K\langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By the nested Artin Approximation Theorem ([Po86, Theorem 1.4]), there exists a solution $\tilde{y}(\mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}) \in K\langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y}_i &\in K\langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle, 1 \le i \le n, \\ \tilde{y}_{n+j} &\in K\langle \mathbf{c}\rangle, 1 \le j \le l, \\ \tilde{y}_{n+l+1} &\in K\langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{y}(\mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}) - \hat{y}(\mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}) \in \langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle^2. \tag{2.2}$$

Passing to the k-jet spaces by projection $j^k : K[[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{c}]] \to K[[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{c}]]/\langle \mathbf{x}\rangle^{k+1}$ we get

$$j^k\big(P(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{c},j^k(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}))\big) = j^k\big(H(j^k(\tilde{y}_1),\dots,j^k(\tilde{y}_n),\mathbf{c})\big) - j^k(\tilde{y}_{n+l+1}) \cdot j^k\big(F(\mathbf{x},j^k(\tilde{y}_{n+1}),\dots,j^k(\tilde{y}_{n+l}))\big) = 0.$$

Let A be the set of the coefficients of $\mathbf{x}^\alpha, |\alpha| \le k$ which appear in all $j^k(\tilde{y}_i)(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{c}), i = 1,\dots,n+l+1$. Then $A \subset K\langle \mathbf{c}\rangle$ since $K\langle \mathbf{c},\mathbf{x}\rangle \subset K\langle \mathbf{c}\rangle[[\mathbf{x}]]$ (cf. [Ng12]). It follows from Remark 2.19 that there exists an étale neighbourhood $\varphi : U, \mathbf{u}_0 \to \mathbb{A}^N, 0$ such that $a(\varphi(u)) \in \mathcal{O}(U)$ for all $a(\mathbf{c}) \in A$. This implies that

$$j^k\big(P(\mathbf{x},\varphi(\mathbf{u}),j^k(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(\varphi(u),x)))\big) = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{O}(U)[[\mathbf{x}]]/\langle \mathbf{x}\rangle^{k+1}.$$

Combining (2.1), (2.2) we obtain that there exists an open neighbourhood $W' \subset U$ of $\mathbf{u}_0$ such that for all $u \in W'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}) &:= \big(j^k\tilde{y}_1(\varphi(\mathbf{u}),\mathbf{x}),\dots,j^k\tilde{y}_n(\varphi(\mathbf{u}),\mathbf{x})\big) \in Aut(K[[\mathbf{x}]]), \\ \psi(\mathbf{u}) &:= \big(\tilde{y}_{n+1}(\varphi(\mathbf{u}),\dots,\tilde{y}_{n+l}(\varphi(\mathbf{u})\big) \in \mathcal{O}(U)^l \text{ and} \\ u(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}) &:= j^k\tilde{y}_{n+l+1}(\varphi(\mathbf{u}),\mathbf{x}) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]^*, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $G \cdot j^k H(\Phi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}),\varphi(u)) = G \cdot F(\mathbf{x},\psi(\mathbf{u}))$. Moreover since k is sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G, it is not difficult to see that there exists an open affine neighbourhood $W \subset W'$ of $\mathbf{u}_0$ such that

$$G \cdot H(\Phi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}),\varphi(u)) = G \cdot j^k H(\Phi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}),\varphi(u)), \ \forall u \in W.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} G \cdot H(\Phi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}),\varphi(u)) &= G \cdot j^k H(\Phi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}),\varphi(u)) \\ &= G \cdot F(\mathbf{x},\psi(\mathbf{u})), \forall u \in W, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. □

Proposition 2.26. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ be such that $\mu(f) < \infty$ (resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$) and let $G = \mathcal{R}$ (resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$). Let $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ be any unfolding of f at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over T. Assume that there exist a finite set $\mathcal{H}$ of unfoldings $h^{(i)}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) := H^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$ of f at $\mathbf{t}^{(i)}$ over affine varieties $T^{(i)}, i = 1, \ldots, q$, and an open neighbourhood $0 \in V \subset T$, such that the set of G-classes of singularities of $f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{t} \in V$, belongs to the set of G-classes of singularities of $\mathcal{H}$. Then*

$$G\text{-mod}_F(f) \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} G_k\text{-mod}_{H^{(i)}}(T^{(i)}) \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{\dim T^{(i)}\}.$$

Proof. Let k be sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G. Considering the morphisms

$$\Phi_k : T \to J_k,\ \mathbf{t} \mapsto j^k f_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and } \Phi^{(i)}_k : T^{(i)} \to J_k,\ \mathbf{s} \mapsto j^k h^{(i)}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}), i = 1, \ldots, q,$$

and applying Corollary 2.12 we obtain

$$G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(V) \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi^{(i)}_k}(V)\} \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{\dim T^{(i)}\}.$$

Hence

$$G\text{-mod}(f) = G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi_k}(0) \leq G_k\text{-mod}_{\Phi^{(i)}_k}(T^{(i)}) \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{\dim T^{(i)}\}.$$

□

Combining Propositions 2.23 and 2.26 we get

Corollary 2.27. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ be such that $\mu(f) < \infty$ resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$. f is G-simple iff it is of* finite G-unfolding type, *i.e. there exists a finite set $\mathcal{F}$ of G-classes of singularities satisfying: for any (or, equivalently, for one G-complete) unfolding $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ of f at $\mathbf{t}_0$ over an affine variety T, there exists a Zariski open neighbourhood V of $\mathbf{t}_0 \in T$, such that the set of G-classes of singularities of $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$, $\mathbf{t} \in V$, belongs to the set $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proposition 2.28. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ be such that $\mu(f) < \infty$ (resp. $\tau(f) < \infty$) and let $G = \mathcal{R}$ (resp. $G = \mathcal{K}$). Let $m = mt(f)$ be the multiplicity of f. Then*

$$G\text{-mod}(f) \geq \binom{n+m-1}{m} - n^2.$$

In particular,

(i) *if $n = 2$, then G-mod$(f) \geq m - 3$;*

(ii) *if $n \geq 3$ and $m \geq 3$, then G-mod$(f) \geq \dfrac{m^2 + 3m - 16}{2}$.*

Proof. Let k be sufficiently large for f w.r.t. G. Then $k \geq m$ and G-mod$(f) = G_k$-mod$(j^k f)$. Put $X := \mathfrak{m}^m/\mathfrak{m}^{k+1} \subset J_k$. It follows from Proposition 2.4(iii) that

$$G\text{-mod}(f) \text{ in } J_k \geq G\text{-mod}(f) \text{ in } X.$$

Let the linear group $G' := GL(n, K)$ act on $X' := \mathfrak{m}^m/\mathfrak{m}^{m+1}$ by $G' \times X' \to X'$, $(A, g(\mathbf{x})) \mapsto g(A\mathbf{x})$. Consider the projection $p : X \to X'$. It is easy to see that p is open and $G \cdot g \subset p^{-1}\big(G' \cdot p(g)\big)$ for all $g \in X$. Then Proposition 2.4(iv) yields

$$G\text{-mod}(g) \geq G'\text{-mod}(p(g)),\ \forall g \in X.$$

In order to prove the proposition, it is sufficiently to show that

$$G'\text{-mod}(p(g)) \geq \binom{n+m-1}{m} - n^2, \forall g \in X.$$

Indeed, it is easy to see that

$$\dim X' = \binom{n+m-1}{m} \text{ and } \dim GL(n,K) = n^2.$$

Hence, by Proposition 2.4(i),

$$\begin{aligned} GL(n,K)\text{-mod}(p(g)) &\geq \dim X' - \dim GL(n,K) \\ &= \binom{n+m-1}{m} - n^2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

(i) and (ii) follow from explicit calculations. □

3. Classification of right simple singularities

In this section we classify the right simple singularities $f \in K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ for K an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. The classification of contact simple singularities was done in [GK90]. In contrast to $char(K) = 0$, where the classification of right simple and contact simple singularities coincides, the classification is very different in positive characteristic. For example, for every $p > 0$, there are only finitely many classes of right simple singularities and for $p = 2$ only the A_1-singularity in an even number of variables is right simple. The classification of right simple singularities is summarized in Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $\mathrm{char} K = p > 0$. *Let* $f(x) \in K[[x]]$ *be a univariate singularity such that its Milnor number* $\mu := \mu(f)$ *is finite. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f) = [\mu/p], \textit{the integer part of } \mu/p.$$

In particular, f *is right simple if and only if* $\mu < p$, *and then* $f \sim_r x^{\mu+1}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let* $p = \mathrm{char}(K) > 2$.

(i) *A plane curve singularity* $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[x,y]]$ *is right simple if and only if it is right equivalent to one of the following forms*

Name	*Normal form*	
A_k	$x^2 + y^{k+1}$	$1 \leq k \leq p-2$
D_k	$x^2y + y^{k-1}$	$4 \leq k < p$
E_6	$x^3 + y^4$	$3 < p$
E_7	$x^3 + xy^3$	$3 < p$
E_8	$x^3 + y^5$	$5 < p$

Table 3.2 (a)

(ii) *A hypersurface singularity* $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]], n \geq 3$, *is right simple if and only if it is right equivalent to one of the following forms*

Normal form	
$g(x_1, x_2) + x_3^2 + \ldots + x_n^2$	*g is one of the singularities in Table 3.2 (a)*

Table 3.2 (b)

Theorem 3.3. *Let* $p = \mathrm{char}(K) = 2$. *A hypersurface singularity* $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ *with* $n \geq 2$, *is right simple if and only if n is even and if it is right equivalent to*

$$\mathrm{A}_1 : x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + \ldots + x_{n-1}x_n.$$

3.1. **Univariate singularities in positive characteristic.** Let $K[[x]]$ be the ring of univariate formal power series. It is obvious that G-mod$(f) = 0$ for all $f \in K[[x]]$ if either $p := char(K) = 0$ or $G = \mathcal{K}$. For the complete classification of univariate singularities as stated in Theorem 3.1 we refer to [Ng12]. Here we prove only the second part, i.e. f is right simple iff $\mu < p$ and then $f \sim_r x^{\mu+1}$. The "if"-statement follows easily from the upper semi-continuity of the Milnor number and the following fact: If $p \nmid mt(f)$ (in particular, if $\mu < p$) then $f \sim_r x^{mt(f)}$ (cf. [BGM12, Thm. 2.1]).

It suffices to show that if $\mu \geq p$ then $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(f) \geq 1$. Indeed, since $\mu \geq p$, $m := mt(f) \geq p$. If $m = p$ then we may assume that $f = x^p + a_{p+1}x^{p+1} + \ldots \in K[[x]]$. Consider the unfolding

$$f_t = f + tx^{p+1} = x^p + (t + a_{p+1})x^{p+1} + \ldots.$$

of f. We show that $f_t \sim_r f_{t'}$ implies $t = t'$. If $\varphi(x) = u_1x + u_2x^2 + \ldots$ is in $\mathcal{R}$ then $u_1 \neq 0$ and

$$\varphi(f_t) = u_1^px^p + u_2^px^{2p} + \ldots + (t + a_{p+1})u_1^{p+1}x^{p+1} + \ldots.$$

If $\varphi(f_t) = f_{t'}$ then $u_1^p = 1$, hence $u_1 = 1$, and $t = t'$. This implies that $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(f) \geq 1$ by Corollary 2.27.

Now, assume that $m > p$. Consider the unfolding $g_t := G(x, t) := f + t \cdot x^p$ of f. By Proposition 2.18, there exists an open neighbourhood V of 0 in K such that $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(g_t) \leq \mathcal{R}$-mod(f) for all $t \in V$. Take a $t_0 \in V \setminus \{0\}$, then the above case with $mt = p$ yields that $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(g_{t_0}) \geq 1$ since $mt(g_{t_0}) = p$, and hence

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f) \geq \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(g_{t_0}) \geq 1.$$

3.2. **Right simple plane curve singularities in characteristic** > 2. Here and in the next section let $f \in K[[x, y]]$, $mt(f)$ its multiplicity and $\mu = \mu(f)$ its Milnor number, which we assume to be finite. Let $p = char(K)$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $mt(f) = 2$ *and* $p > 2$.

(i) *If* $\mu < p - 1$, *then* $f \sim_r A_\mu$ *and f is right simple.*

(ii) *If* $\mu \geq p-1$, *then* f *is not right simple.*

Proof. Since $mt(f) = 2$ and $p > 2$, it follows from the right splitting lemma (Lemma 3.7) that f is right equivalent to $x^2 + g(y)$ with $g(y) = y^2$ if $\operatorname{crk}(f) = 1$ (case A_1) and $mt(g) \geq 3$ if $\operatorname{crk}(f) = 1$.

(i) If $\mu < p-1$ then $mt(g) < p$. By Theorem 3.1, $g \sim_r y^{mt(g)}$ and hence $f \sim_r A_\mu$. Moreover, Theorem 3.1 yields that g is right simple and so is f by Lemma 3.9(iii).

(ii) If $\mu \geq p-1$, then $mt(g) \geq p$. Combining Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.9(iii) we get that f is not right simple.

□

Proposition 3.5. *Let* $p > 3$, *let* $mt(f) = 3$ *and and* f_3 *be the* tangent cone *(i.e. the homogeneous component of degree* 3*) of* f. *Let* $r(f_3)$ *be the number of linear factors of* f_3.

(i) *If* $r(f_3) \geq 2$ *then* $f \sim_r x^2y + g(y)$ *with* $mt(g) = \mu - 1 \geq 3$. *If additionally* $4 \leq \mu < p$, *then* $f \sim_r D_\mu$ *and* f *is right simple.*

(ii) *If* $r(f_3) = 1$, $p = 5$ *and* $6 \leq \mu \leq 7$ *then* $f \sim_r E_\mu$ *and* f *is right simple.*

(iii) *If* $r(f_3) = 1$, $p > 5$ *and* $6 \leq \mu \leq 8$ *then* $f \sim_r E_\mu$ *and* f *is right simple.*

Proof. This may be proved in much the same way as [GLS06, Thm. I.2.51, Cor. I.2.52, Thm. I.2.53, Cor. I.2.54], by applying the finite determinacy theorem in positive characteristic [BGM12, Thm. 2.1]. For details we refer to [Ng12]. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let* $mt(f) = 3$. *Let* $r(f_3)$ *be the number of linear factors of* f_3. *Then* f *is not right simple if*

(i) *either* $p = 3$;

(ii) *or* $p > 3$, $r(f_3) \geq 2$ *and* $\mu \geq p$;

(iii) *or* $p > 5$, $r(f_3) = 1$ *and* $\mu > 8$;

(iv) *or* $p = 5$, $r(f_3) = 1$ *and* $\mu \geq 8$.

Proof. (i) We consider the unfolding $F(x, y, t) = f + t \cdot x^2$ of f at 0 over K. Since $mt(f) = 3$ and since $p = 3$, it is easy to see that $\mu(f_t) > 2$ for all $t \neq 0$. Proposition 3.4(ii) yields that $f_t, t \neq 0$ is not right simple and hence neither is f by Proposition 2.18.

(ii) By Proposition 3.5(i), $f \sim_r x^2y + g(y)$ with $mt(g) = \mu - 1$. It suffices to show that $h := x^2y + g(y)$ is not right simple. We write

$$g(y) = a \cdot y^{\mu-1} + \ldots \text{ with } a \neq 0$$

and consider the unfolding

$$h_t := H(x, y, t) = \begin{cases} x^2y + g(y) + tx^2 + ty^p & \text{if } \mu > p \\ x^2y + g(y) + at^2x^2 + atxy^{(p-1)/2} & \text{if } \mu = p \end{cases}$$

of h at 0 over K. It is easy to see that $\mu(f_t) \geq p$ for all $t \neq 0$. It follows from Proposition 3.4 that $h_t, t \neq 0$ is not right simple and hence neither is h due to Proposition 2.18.

(iii) This is done by the same argument as in [GLS06, Thm. I.2.55(2)(ii)].

(iv) Since $r(f_3) = 1$ and $\mu \geq 8$, using the same argument as in [GLS06, Thm. I.2.53] we get

$$f \sim_r g := x^2 y + \alpha y^5 + \beta x y^4 + h(x, y)$$

with $\alpha, \beta \in K$ and $h \in \mathfrak{m}^6$. Consider the unfolding $g_t := G(x, y, t) = g(x, y) + t \cdot xy^4$ of g at 0 over K and assume that $g_t \sim_r g_{t'}$, i.e. there exists an automorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : K[[x, y]] &\longrightarrow K[[x, y]] \\ x &\mapsto \varphi = \sum a_{ij} x^i y^j \\ y &\mapsto \psi = \sum b_{ij} x^i y^j \end{aligned}$$

such that $g_t(x, y) = g_{t'}(\varphi, \psi)$. By a simple calculation we conclude that $(\beta + t)^3 = (\beta + t')^3$ and hence, for fixed t, $g_t \sim_r g_{t'}$ for at most three values of t'. It follows from Corollary 2.27 that g is not right simple and hence neither is f. ☐

Proof of Theorem 3.2(i). It follows from Propositions 2.28, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6. ☐

3.3. **Right simple hypersurface singularities in characteristic > 2.** The aim of this paragraph is to prove Theorem 3.2(ii). Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$. We denote by

$$H(f) := \Big(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(0)\Big)_{i,j=1,\ldots,n} \in \mathrm{Mat}(n \times n, K)$$

the *Hessian (matrix)* of f and by $\mathrm{crk}(f) := n - \mathrm{rank}(H(f))$ the *corank* of f.

Lemma 3.7 (Right splitting lemma in characteristic different from 2)**.** *If $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, $char(K) > 2$, has corank $\mathrm{crk}(f) = k \geq 0$, then*

$$f \sim_r g(x_1, \ldots, x_k) + x_{k+1}^2 + \ldots + x_n^2$$

with $g \in \mathfrak{m}^3$. g is called the residual part *of f, it is uniquely determined up to right equivalence.*

Proof. cf. [GLS06, Thm. I.2.47]. The proof in [GLS06] was given for $K = \mathbb{C}$ but works in characteristic different from 2. ☐

Lemma 3.8. *Let $p = char(K) > 2$ and let*

$$f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = x_n^2 + f_i'(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]],\ i = 1, 2.$$

Then $f_1 \sim_r f_2$ if and only if $f_1' \sim_r f_2'$.

Proof. The direction, $f_1' \sim_r f_2' \Rightarrow f_1 \sim_r f_2$ is obvious. We now show the other one,

$$f_1 \sim_r f_2 \Rightarrow f_1' \sim_r f_2'.$$

First, assume that $f_1 \sim_r f_2$. Then $\mathrm{crk}(f_1) = \mathrm{crk}(f_2) := k$ and therefore $\mathrm{crk}(f_1') = \mathrm{crk}(f_2') = k$. It follows from Lemma 3.7 that

$$f_i' \sim_r g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_k) + x_{k+1}^2 + \ldots + x_{n-1}^2,\ i = 1, 2.$$

and hence

$$f_i \sim_r g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_k) + x_{k+1}^2 + \ldots + x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2.$$

This implies

$$g_1(x_1,\dots,x_k)+x_{k+1}^2+\dots+x_n^2 \sim_r g_2(x_1,\dots,x_k)+x_{k+1}^2+\dots+x_n^2$$

since $f_1 \sim_r f_2$. The uniqueness of g_i shows that $g_1 \sim_r g_2$, i.e. there exists an automorphism $\Phi' \in Aut_K(K[[x_1,\dots,x_k]])$ such that $\Phi'(g_1)=g_2$. The automorphism

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\Phi : K[[x_1,\dots,x_{n-1}]] & \longrightarrow & K[[x_1,\dots,x_{n-1}]]\\ x_i & \mapsto & \Phi'(x_i), i=1,\dots,k\\ x_j & \mapsto & x_j, j=k+1,\dots,n-1\end{array}$$

yields that

$$g_1(x_1,\dots,x_k)+x_{k+1}^2+\dots+x_{n-1}^2 \sim_r g_2(x_1,\dots,x_k)+x_{k+1}^2+\dots+x_{n-1}^2$$

and hence $f_1' \sim_r f_2'$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.9. *Let* $p=char(K)>2, n\geq 2,$ *and let*

$$f(x_1,\dots,x_n)=x_n^2+f'(x_1,\dots,x_{n-1})\in \mathfrak{m}^2\subset K[[x_1,\dots,x_n]]$$

be such that $\mu(f)<\infty$.

(i) *Let* $F'(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{t})\in\langle x_1,\dots,x_{n-1}\rangle\subset\mathcal{O}(T)[[x_1,\dots,x_{n-1}]]$ *be an unfolding of* f' *at* $\mathbf{t}_0$ *over an affine variety* T *and let* $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{t})=x_n^2+F'(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{t})$. *Then*

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_F(f)=\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{F'}(f').$$

(ii) *We have*

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f) \text{ in } K[[x_1,\dots,x_n]]=\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f') \text{ in } K[[x_1,\dots,x_{n-1}]].$$

Proof. Let k be sufficiently large for f and for f' w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}$. Let $\mathfrak{m}'$ be the maximal ideal in $K[[\mathbf{x}']]$ and let $J_k:=K[[\mathbf{x}']]/\mathfrak{m}'^{k+1}$.

(i) Consider three morphisms

$$\begin{array}{rcl}h_k : T & \longrightarrow & J_k\\ \mathbf{t} & \mapsto & j^k f_{\mathbf{t}}\end{array} \quad\text{and}\quad \begin{array}{rcl}h_k' : T & \longrightarrow & J_k'\\ \mathbf{t} & \mapsto & j^k f_{\mathbf{t}}'.\end{array}$$

and $p: J_k\to J_k'$ the natural projection. Then $h_k'=p\circ h_k$ and

$$h_k^{-1}(\mathcal{R}\cdot h_k(\mathbf{t}))=h_k'^{-1}(\mathcal{R}\cdot h_k'(\mathbf{t}))$$

by Lemma 3.8. It follows from Corollary 2.11 that $\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{h_k}(\mathbf{t}_0)=\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{h_k'}(\mathbf{t}_0)$, and hence $\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_F(f)=\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{F'}(f')$.

(ii) Let $\{g_1'(\mathbf{x}'),\dots,g_l'(\mathbf{x}')\}$ be a system of generators of $\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'\cdot j(f')$. Then $\{x_n, g_1(\mathbf{x}),\dots,g_l(\mathbf{x})\}$ with $g_i(\mathbf{x})=g_i'(\mathbf{x}')$, is a system of generators of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}\cdot j(f)$. Proposition 2.25 yields that

$$F'(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{t})=f'+\sum_{i=1}^{l}t_ig_i'(\mathbf{x}') \text{ resp. } F_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{t})=f+\sum_{i=1}^{l}t_ig_i(\mathbf{x})+t_0x_n$$

is a right complete unfoldings of f' resp. f. Consider the unfolding

$$F = f + \sum_{i=1}^{l} t_i g_i(\mathbf{x})$$

of f. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{F_1}(f) = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_F(f)$. This implies, by (i), that

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{F_1}(f) = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_F(f) = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}_{F'}(f')$$

and hence $\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f) = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f')$ due to Proposition 2.23. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2(ii). The "if"-statement follows from Theorem 3.2(i) and Lemma 3.9. We now consider any simple singularity $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. Then by the splitting lemma,

$$f \sim_r f'(x_1, \dots, x_k) + x_{k+1}^2 + \ldots + x_n^2$$

with $f' \in \langle x_1, \dots, x_k\rangle^3$ and $k = \text{crk}(f)$. Again by Lemma 3.9,

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f') = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f) = 0.$$

It follows from Proposition 2.28 that

$$0 = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f') \geq \binom{m+k-1}{m} - k^2,$$

where $m = mt(f') \geq 3$. This implies that $k \leq 2$, i.e.

$$f \sim_r g(x_1, x_2) + x_3^2 + \ldots + x_n^2,$$

for some simple singularity $g \in K[[x_1, x_2]]$. The proof thus follows from Theorem 3.1, 3.2(i) and Lemma 3.8. □

3.4. **Right simple hypersurface singularities in characteristic 2.** Let $p = char(K) = 2$ and let $n \geq 2$.

Lemma 3.10 (Right splitting lemma in characteristic 2)**.** *Let $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \dots, x_n]], n \geq 2$. Then there exists an l, $0 \leq 2l \leq n$ such that*

$$f \sim_r x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + \ldots + x_{2l-1}x_{2l} + g(x_{2l+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

with $g \in \langle x_{2l+1}, \dots, x_n\rangle^3$ or $g \in x_{2l+1}^2 + \langle x_{2l+1}, \dots, x_n\rangle^3$ if $2l < n$. g is called the residual part *of f, it is uniquely determined up to right equivalence.*

Proof. It follows easily from [GK90, Lemma 1 and 2]. □

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\mu(f) < \infty$ and*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_{n-1}x_n + f'(x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}) \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[x_1, \dots, x_n]].$$

Then

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f) \text{ in } K[[x_1, \dots, x_n]] = \mathcal{R}\text{-mod}(f') \text{ in } K[[x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}]].$$

Proof. By using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. □

Remark 3.12. Since $\mu(x_1x_2) = 1$, $x_1x_2 \in K[[x_1, x_2]]$ is right 2-determined and any unfolding of x_1x_2 is either right equivalent to itself or smooth. Hence x_1x_2 is right simple.

Proposition 3.13. *Let $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ with $\mu(f) < \infty$. Then f is not right simple if*

(i) *either $f = x_1^2 + g(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ with $g \in \mathfrak{m}^3$,*

(ii) *or $f \in \mathfrak{m}^3$.*

Proof. (i) Let $k \geq 3$ be sufficiently large for f w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}$ and let $X := \mathfrak{m}^2/\mathfrak{m}^{k+1}$. Then $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(f) = \mathcal{R}_k$-mod$(j^k f)$. Let

$$Y := x_1^2 + \mathfrak{m}^3/\mathfrak{m}^{k+1} \subset J_k,\ Y' := x_1^2 + \mathfrak{m}^3/\mathfrak{m}^4$$

and let

$$\mathcal{H} := \{\Phi \in \mathcal{R}_k\ |\Phi(x_1) = x_1\},\ \mathcal{H}' := \{\Phi \in \mathcal{R}_1\ |\Phi(x_1) = x_1\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{H}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}'$) acts on Y (resp. Y') by $(\Phi, y) \mapsto \Phi(y)$ and we have

$$i^{-1}(\mathcal{R}_k \cdot i(y)) = \mathcal{H} \cdot y \subset p^{-1}(\mathcal{H}' \cdot p(y))\ \forall y \in Y'$$

with the inclusion $i : Y \hookrightarrow X$ and the projection $p : Y \twoheadrightarrow Y'$. It follows from Proposition 2.4(iv) that

$$\mathcal{R}_k\text{-mod}(y) \geq \mathcal{H}\text{-mod}(y) \geq \mathcal{H}'\text{-mod}(p(y)), \forall y \in Y.$$

Moreover, Proposition 2.4(i) yields that

$$\mathcal{H}'\text{-mod}(p(y)) \geq \dim Y' - \dim \mathcal{H}' = \binom{n+2}{3} - n(n-1) \geq 1.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{R}_k$-mod$(y) \geq 1$ for all $y \in Y$ and hence $\mathcal{R}$-mod$(f) \geq 1$.

(ii) By (i), f_t is not right simple for all $t \neq 0$, where $f_t(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x}, t) = f(\mathbf{x}) + tx_1^2$ is an unfolding of f at 0 over K. Hence Proposition 2.18 yields that f is not right simple. ☐

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The “if”-statement is obvious. Now, take a right simple singularity $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. Then $mt(f) = 2$ by Proposition 2.28. The splitting lemma (Lemma 3.10) yields that f is right equivalent to

$$x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + \ldots + x_{2l-1}x_{2l} + g(x_{2l+1}, \ldots, x_n)$$

with $g \in \langle x_{2l+1}, \ldots, x_n\rangle^3$ or $g \in x_{2l+1}^2 + \langle x_{2l+1}, \ldots, x_n\rangle^3$ if $2l < n$. Combining Lemma 3.11 and Proposition 3.13 we obtain that $2l = n$, which proves the theorem. ☐

REFERENCES

[AGV85] Arnol'd, V. I.; Gusein-Zade, S. M.; Varchenko, A. N.: *Singularities of differentiable maps,* Vol I. Birkhäuser (1985).

[Arn72] Arnol'd, V. I.: *Normal forms for functions near degenerate critical points, the Weyl groups of A_k, D_k, E_k and Lagrangian singularities,* Functional Anal. Appl. 6 (1972), 254-272.

[BGM12] Boubakri, Y.; Greuel, G.-M.; Markwig, T.: *Invariants of hypersurface singularities in positive characteristic,* Rev. Mat. Complut. 25 (2012), 61-85.

[Bor91] Borel, A.: *Linear algebraic groups,* 2nd edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 126, Springer-Verlag (1991).

[GK90] Greuel, G.-M.; Kröning, H.: *Simple singularities in positive characteristic,* Math. Z. 203 (1990), 339-354.

[GLS06] Greuel, G.-M.; Lossen, C.; Shustin, E.: *Introduction to singularities and deformations,* Math. Monographs, Springer-Verlag (2006).

[Har77] Hartshorne, R.: *Algebraic Geometry,* Springer-Verlag (1977).

[KaS72] Kas, A.; Schlessinger, M.: *On the versal deformation of a complex space with an isolated singularity,* Math. Ann. 196 (1972), 23-29.

[KPPRM78] Kurke, H.; Pfister, G.; Popescu, D.; Roczen, M.; Mostowski, T.: *Die Approximationseigenschaft lokaler Ringe,* Lecture Notes in Math. 634, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1978).

[MFK82] Mumford, D.; Fogarty, J.; Kirwan, F.: *Geometric invariants theory,* Second edition. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1982).

[Mum88] Mumford, D.: *The red book of varieties and schemes,* Lecture Notes in Math. 1358, Springer-Verlag (1988).

[Na53] Nagata, M.: *On the theory of Henselian rings,* Nagoya Math. J. 5 (1953), 45-57.

[Ng12] Nguyen, H. D.: *Classification of singularities in positive characteristic,* Ph.D. thesis, TU Kaiserslautern (2012).

[Po86] Popescu, D.: *General Néron desingularization and approximation,* Nagoya Math. J. 104 (1986), 85-115.

[Ra70] Raynaud, M.: *Anneaux locaux Henséliens,* Lecture Notes in Math. 169, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1970).

[Ros56] Rosenlicht, M.: *Some basic theorems on algebraic groups,* Amer. J. Math. 78 (1956), 401-443.

[Ros63] Rosenlicht, M.: *A remark on qoutient spaces,* An. Acad. Brasil. Ci. 35 (1963), 487-489.

GERT-MARTIN GREUEL
UNIVERSITÄT KAISERSLAUTERN, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, ERWIN-SCHRÖDINGER-STRASSE,
67663 KAISERSLAUTERN
E-mail address: `greuel@mathematik.uni-kl.de`

NGUYEN HONG DUC[2]
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, 18 HOANG QUOC VIET ROAD, CAU GIAY DISTRICT
10307, HANOI.
E-mail address: `nhduc@math.ac.vn`

UNIVERSITÄT KAISERSLAUTERN, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, ERWIN-SCHRÖDINGER-STRASSE,
67663 KAISERSLAUTERN
E-mail address: `dnguyen@mathematik.uni-kl.de`

---

[2] Supported by DAAD (Germany) and NAFOSTED (Vietnam).